

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Amendments

The Applicant has amended claims 1, 2, 4-7, 10 and 13; claims 3, 8-9, 12 and 16 have been canceled. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1, 2, 4-7, 10-11, 13-15 and 17 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claims 1-11 and 13-17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Couturier (US 6,683,868) in view of Grech and Unmehopa (Using Open Service Access to Enable Mobile Internet Applications in UMTS Networks), and further in view of ETSI (Universal Mobile Telecommunications System (UMTS): Virtual Home Environment/Open Service Architecture), and further in view of Ekstrom et al (US 6,148,069). Claims 3, 8-9, 12 and 16 have been canceled. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejection of the remaining claims and has further amended the claims to more distinctly and clearly claim the subject matter which Applicant believes is his invention. A favorable reconsideration is requested.

MPEP 2143 - To establish a prima facie case of obviousness, three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Finally, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. The teaching or suggestion to make the claimed combination and the reasonable expectation of success must both be found in the prior art, not in applicant's disclosure. *In re Vaeck*, 947 F.2d 488, 20 USPQ2d 1438 (Fed. Cir. 1991).

The Applicant respectfully submits that the rejection is based on FOUR prior art references and there is no explanation as to why the Couturier reference may have suggested combining the three remaining references to show un-patentability due to

obviousness. The Applicant respectfully submits that hindsight is impermissible and this rejection appears to be the result of the Examiner assembling references to fit a particular need in the rejection of these claims. "The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination." *In re Mills*, 916 F.2d 680, 16 USPQ2d 1430 (Fed. Cir. 1990)

A person skilled in the art, beginning from the Couturier reference, would not likely consult the teachings of the Grech and Unmehopa reference, the ETSI reference and the Ekstrom reference. However, even if the additional references were consulted, the combination of Couturier, Grech and Unmehopa, ETSI and Ekstrom references does not make obvious the claims of the present invention.

The Applicant's present invention solves the problem of a service being offered by an application in an open service architecture that requires the involvement of more than one service capability server. And, the solution is transparent to both the application offering the service as well as the user. The solution is for the UISCs to communicate with the CCSCS to make a connection and at the end of the communication, send a request for termination to the CCSCS.

The Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner's attention to amended claim 1:

1. (Currently Amended) A method of service provisioning in a telecommunications system comprising a configuration of service switching points (SSP), service capability servers (SCS) and service provisioning equipment, the configuration used to provide services to users, wherein at least one of the services requires more than one service capability server, the method comprising the steps of:

responsive to a request from a user for user interaction, requesting a call control service capability server (CCSCS), to set up a connection towards the service provisioning equipment using a User Interaction Service Capability Server (UISCs); and

the CCSCS terminating the connection towards the service provisioning equipment when the user interaction is complete. (emphasis added)

The Applicant respectfully submits that, individually or in combination, the prior art references do not solve this problem in the manner in which the Applicant discloses.

Rather than recite the limitations disclosed by the prior art, the Applicant will recite the limitations in claim 1 that the prior art references do not disclose. The prior art, individually or in combination, do not teach or suggest a call control service capability server (CCSCS), setting up a connection between a user and a service utilizing a User Interaction Service Capability Server (UISCS). And, neither do any of the prior art references teach or suggest that when the user completes use of the service, the UISCS instructs the CCSCS to terminate the connection.

Therefore, even if one skilled in the art were motivated to combine the four references as suggested by the Detailed Action, the combination would still fail to render claim 1 unpatentable for at least the reason that the combination fails to disclose a CCSCS setting up a connection towards a service provisioning equipment for a user interaction and the CCSCS terminating the connection when the user interaction is complete. This being the case, the Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of claim 1.


Claim 13 is an analogous independent claim to claim 1 and contains similar limitations. The Applicant respectfully submits that claim 13 is allowable as are the respective dependent claims. Therefore, the allowance of dependent claims 2, 4-7, 10-11, 14-15 and 17 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,



By Sidney L. Weatherford
Registration No. 45,602

Date: December 16, 2008

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-8656
sidney.weatherford@ericsson.com